

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

GARREN HANDSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

OVERLAKE HOSPITAL MEDICAL  
CENTER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. C15-1772RSL

ORDER RENOTING DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT

This matter comes before the Court on “Plaintiff’s Request for Motion to Extend Motion in Limine Deadline” (Dkt. # 53) and “Plaintiff’s Request for Motion to Extend Discovery” (Dkt. # 54). Having reviewed the requests and the remainder of the record, the Court finds that plaintiff has failed to show good cause to reopen discovery. Nevertheless, plaintiff will be given a brief period of time in which to supplement the evidence offered in opposition to defendants’ motion for summary judgment in order to overcome the evidentiary objections defendants raised in reply. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and, to the extent that he has admissible evidence in support of his claims, his lack of legal acumen should not be the dispositive factor in this case. Plaintiff should be aware that statements made in his declaration that are not based on personal knowledge, reflect out-of-court statements of third parties offered for the truth of the matters

ORDER

1 asserted, or are conclusory are not admissible and will not be considered as evidence.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff  
2 shall, to the extent possible, provide additional evidentiary support in the form of declarations  
3 under oath from third parties and/or documents.

4 The Clerk of Court is directed to renote “Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment”  
5 (Dkt. # 26) on the Court’s calendar for Friday, March 10, 2017. Plaintiff may, on or before  
6 March 9, 2017, file an amended affidavit under penalty of perjury in opposition to defendants’  
7 motion for summary judgment. The substance of the affidavit shall remain unchanged, but  
8 plaintiff may provide additional citations to (and copies of) new evidence that supports the  
9 statements contained in the affidavit.

10 Plaintiff’s request for an extension of the motion in limine deadline is GRANTED. A new  
11 deadline will be established if necessary after the motion for summary judgment is resolved.

12  
13 Dated this 7th day of February, 2017.

14 

15 Robert S. Lasnik

16 United States District Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>1</sup> Not all of defendants’ objections are well-taken. For example, plaintiff is in a position to state  
26 whether and what percentage of the time he was required to exceed certain exertional limits (Dkt. # 52-1  
at 9) and that he was told to take a week off (Dkt. # 52-1 at 10).